

REMARKS

Claims 1-46, 49-50, and 52-54 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13-15, 19, 46, and 49 are amended herein. Claims 47-48 and 51 are cancelled herein. Claims 52-54 are added herein. Support for the amendments and additions can be found throughout the application, drawings, and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cureton et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,901,369). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cureton et al. is directed to a feedlot computer system using global positioning. The system described in Cureton et al. is directed to providing feed to feedlots by directing trucks and determining the amount of feed delivered to a particular lot or trough. See Cureton et al. Fig. 1, col. 1, Ins. 23-31. Cureton et al. is directed to monitoring and driving feed delivery trucks, but does not appear to be directed to or fairly disclose monitoring various parameters and results, as discussed further herein.

Claim 1 recites:

An integrator system to assist in providing a selected product from a farm house having a structure substantially enclosing an area and substantially covering the area, comprising:

an integrator processor positioned a distance from the farm house, said integrator processor operable to determine an optimal quality and yield of the selected product from the farm house; and . . .

wherein said integrator processor determines a substantially real time optimal condition for the farm house in consideration of the optimal quality and yield of the selected product from the farm house[.]

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose an integrator system having a farm house and integrator processor as recited in claim 1. Cureton et al. is directed toward a single management and control system for an open feedlot. Moreover, Cureton et al. does not disclose a system including an integrator processor that determines an optimal quality and yield of a product from a farm house and determines an optimal condition for the farm house in consideration of the optimal quality and yield of the product. For example, Cureton et al. discloses a feedlot computer network for managing and controlling a single feedlot, but does not appear to disclose an offsite integrator processor as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvious claim 1 and that claim 1 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claims 2-14 and 39-41 depend on claim 1 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should be patentable.

Claim 15 recites:

monitoring said selected parameter;
comparing the monitored parameter to the selected parameter tolerance;
and
sending instructions from the second party to the first party to perform a selected action based on the comparison of the monitored parameter to the selected parameter tolerance.

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose selecting a farm owned by a first party and having a second party select a parameter to monitor, determine an optimal quality and yield of an item from the farm house, and select a parameter

tolerance in consideration of the optimal quality and yield. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose comparing a monitored parameter to such a parameter tolerance. For example, as stated herein with respect to claim 1, Cureton et al. is directed toward a single feedlot management and control system, but does not appear to disclose monitoring and controlling a farm house by a second party as recited in claim 15. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvious claim 15 and that claim 15 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claims 16-23 and 42 depend on claim 15 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Furthermore, claim 19, which depends from claim 15, recites:

selecting a second farm house; . . .
monitoring said selected said parameter in said selected second farm house;
comparing the monitored first parameter and the monitored second parameter to determine a best parameter of the first parameter and the second parameter[.]

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose a method including all the elements recited in claim 19. As stated herein, Cureton et al. is directed to a single feedlot management and control system. Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose monitoring first and second farm houses and comparing monitored parameters as recited in claim 19. For example, Cureton et al. discloses controlling the delivery of feed and items to bins, but not comparing monitored control parameters. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not anticipate or

fairly render obvious claim 19 and that claim 19 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claim 24 recites, "a processor comparing at least two of the monitored first control parameter within the selected first farm house, the monitored first result parameter of the first product produced in the first selected farm house, the monitored second control parameter within the selected second farm house, and the monitored second result parameter of the second product produced in the second selected farm house." As stated herein, Cureton et al. is directed to a single feedlot management and control system. Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose monitoring two farm houses as recited in claim 24, much less a processor comparing monitored parameters as recited in claim 24. For example, as stated herein with respect to claim 19, Cureton et al. discloses controlling the delivery of feed and items to bins, but not comparing various parameters or features as recited in claim 24. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvious claim 24 and that claim 24 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claims 25-38 and 43-45 depend on claim 24 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claim 46 recites:

determining an optimal quality and yield of a product from the farm house with the integrator; . . .
transmitting the datum wirelessly periodically to the integrator;
accessing the datum;
comparing the datum with the optimal quality and yield of the product from the farm house[.]

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose determining an optimal quality and yield of a product from a farm house with an integrator, much less comparing a datum with the optimal quality and yield of the product from the farm house. As discussed above, Cureton et al. is directed to controlling a feed lot, such as providing food to selected bins. Cureton et al. does not appear to disclose monitoring or comparing, as recited in claim 46. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 46 is not anticipated or fairly rendered obvious by Cureton et al. and that claim 46 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claim 49 recites, “an integrator processor positioned a distance from the farm house, said integrator processor determining an optimal quality and yield of the selected product from within the farm house; and . . . wherein said integrator processor compares the received data from the monitor and the optimal quality and yield of the selected product from the farm house.” Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose a system including an integrator processor positioned away from a farm house that determines an optimal quality and yield of a product from a farm house. Moreover, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose or fairly suggest an integrator processor that compares received data, as recited in claim 49. While Cureton et al. is directed to controlling a feedlot, Cureton et al. does not appear to teach or fairly suggest determining an optimal quality and yield from a farmhouse or comparing it to received data. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvios claim 49 and that claim 49 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claim 50 depends on claim 49 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

NEW CLAIM

New claims 52-54 are added herein. Claims 52-54 depend on one of claims 1, 15, and 24 and, therefore, for at least the reasons stated here with respect to claims 1, 15, and 24, should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Claim 52 recites: "the optimal quality and yield of the selected product from the farm house includes at least one a livestock weight, a livestock size, a livestock health, and combinations thereof." Claim 53 depends on claim 15 and includes similar subject matter.

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose consideration of an optimal quality and yield of a product and/or item as recited in claims 52-53. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claims 52-53 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Additionally, claim 54 recites:

The method of claim 34, wherein the first farm house includes a first structure substantially enclosing a first area and substantially covering the first area, the second farm house includes a second structure substantially enclosing a second area and substantially covering the second area, and an integrator performs said processor comparing, the integrator being at a third position a distance away from each of the first and second positions,

the method further comprising:

determining an optimal quality and yield of the product from each of the first and second farm houses with the integrator, the optimal quality and yield of

the product from each of the first and second farm houses including at least one a livestock weight, a livestock size, a livestock health, and combinations thereof; positioning a first controller in the first farm house; positioning a second controller in the second farm house; and controlling, with the integrator, the first controller and the second controller based on the comparison of the first and second result parameters and the determination of the optimal quality and yield of the product from each of the first and second farm houses.

Applicants submit that Cureton et al. does not disclose determining an optimal quality and yield of a product from a farm house with an integrator positioned away from farm houses. Cureton et al. appears to be focused on controlling and monitoring a feedlot, including delivering feed to particular bins. Though Cureton et al. discloses monitoring the amount of feed delivered, Cureton et al. does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest, among other portions, a comparison of a first and a second result parameter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 54 should be in condition for allowance in light of Cureton et al.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, favorable consideration of claims 52-54 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 2, 2007

By: 
Richard W. Warner
Reg. No. 38,043
Michael L. Taylor
Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWW/MLT/DWH/srh